

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested on the basis of the following particulars.

1. In the claims

Independent claims 1 and 20 are amended to clarify that the second checking operation includes processing all notes qualifying as authentic or reject notes in the first checking operation and excludes notes categorized as being false or suspicious in the first checking operation. Support for this amendment is found in the specification at paragraph [0066].

In reply to the examiner's comments articulated in section (10) of the Action with regard to the allegation that claims 1 and 20 do not recite a result and/or condition for checking all of the bank notes by both the first and second bank note processing machines, the applicant submits that the current amendment to these claims makes clear the conditions upon which the notes are processed by the second bank note processing machine.

Claims 1 and 20 now specify the conditions by which the second bank note processing machine processes notes processed by the first bank note processing machine. Indeed, these claims explicitly require that the claimed system and method have a second bank note processing operation that is expressly dependent upon the first bank note processing operation. As such, the clarification on the second bank note processing operation is not merely an intended use.

It is therefore submitted that the clarification of the second bank note processing operation clearly differentiates the claimed system and method over those apparatuses, systems and methods expressed in the prior art.

Numerous other claims are amended to remove the notation (BN) from the claims, and to consistently refer to "bank notes" or "notes" throughout the claims.

It is asserted that the amendment to the claims finds clear support in the specification. Entry of the amendment to the claims and removal of the objection to certain claims is respectfully requested in the next Office communication.

2. Rejection of claims 1-28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. patent application publication 2004/0225407 (*Kunz*) in view of U.S. patent 5,937,396 (*Konya*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendment to independent claims 1 and 20, from which the remaining claims depend, and the following observations on *Kunz* and *Konya* which demonstrate how the rejected claims are not obvious over *Kunz* and *Konya*.

At the onset, it is submitted that the combination of *Kunz* and *Konya* fails to disclose a system or a method wherein first and second bank note processing machines in first and second checking operations, respectively, process all of the bank notes of a deposit which were considered authentic or reject bank notes in the first checking operation, and the second checking operation excludes the bank notes of the deposit which were categorized as being false or suspicious.

As noted in the applicant's remarks of February 18, 2008, *Kunz* only teaches the feature of supplying bank notes to a second bank note checking device which either cannot be checked unambiguously or have been identified as defective ([0027]). It is explained by *Kunz* that this step is performed in order to reduce the amount of bank notes to be eliminated. The remaining bank notes checked by the first checking device, i.e., those which were successfully checked unambiguously, are not subjected to the second checking operation.

Thus, from these teachings of *Kunz*, the skilled person would not have any understanding of a second checking operation which includes processing all notes qualifying as authentic or reject notes in the first checking operation and excludes notes categorized as being false or suspicious in the first checking operation, as particularly required by claims 1 and 20. Instead, the skilled person would learn from

Kunz to only recheck those bank notes in a second processing operation which were categorized as being false or suspicious in the first checking operation.

It is therefore apparent that *Kunz* teaches a system and a method which is the opposite from that which is recited in the pending claims. Neither *Kunz* nor *Konya* provides any teaching or suggestion of doing contrary to that which is taught by *Kunz*.

In view of these observations, it is submitted that the proposed combination of *Kunz* and *Konya* fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of the pending claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

3. Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: September 29, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205